

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,672	12/22/2003	Khasid M. Ali Khan	5150-83700	7805	
35690	7590 09/30/2005		EXAMINER		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.			PEYTON, TAMMARA R		
	P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2182		
				DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

/	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/743,672	ALI KHAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tammara R. Peyton	2182				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status		·				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	i) Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.					
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
ordinates are subject to restriction and/or	cicolon requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/22/03.	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/743,672

Art Unit: 2182

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-18, 20-28, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (5,457,694) and Masiewicz et al., (US 5,784,390).

As per claims 1, 4, 5-7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-22, 25-28, and 31, Smith (cols. 4-18) teaches method of an analyzer for an ATA interface, comprising: capturing data events from a nondeterministic data bus; transferring said captured data events to a region of a data event buffer as portions of said captured data events become available; accessing said data event buffer to process said captured data events without stopping said transferring. However, Smith is silent in respect to detecting that said region of said data event buffer is full (overflow) during said transferring; and in response to said detecting that said region is full, transferring said captured data events to a different region of said data event buffer without stopping. Masiewicz teaches an error correction system for an ATA interface that detect an overflow (full buffer) by having a court overflow signal that is asserted during a DMA transfer wherein the capturing of the data event continues. (Masiewicz, Abstract, cols.22-26) It would have been obvious to one of skill at the time the invention was made for Smith to implement the error correction system of Masiewicz

that detects an overflow during a DMA transfer because doing so would ensure a faster more reliable data transfer across the host and the ATA interface.

As per claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 20, 23, and 24, Smith/Masiewicz does not teach wherein the data event buffer is circular or linear, however, one of ordinary skill would readily recognize that a circular or a linear buffer is well known in the art, thereby making use of these types of well known buffers obvious to one of ordinary skill.

As per claims 8, 19, and 29, Smith teaches wherein processed data events are shown real time via a display.

As per claims 5, 16, and 26, Smith/Masiewicz does not teach wherein the nondeterministic data bus conforms to the IEEE-488 GPIB standard. Nonetheless, however, one of ordinary skill would readily recognize that the IEEE-488 GPIB standard is well known in the art, thereby making use of this type of bus obvious to one of ordinary skill.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tammara Peyton whose telephone number is (571)

272-4157. The examiner can normally be reached between 6:30 - 4:00 from Monday to Thursday, (I am off every first Friday), and 6:30-3:00 every second Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Popovici Dov can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Mailed responses to this action should be sent to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231.

Faxes for Official/formal (After Final) communications or for informal or draft communications (please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT") sent to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

USTPO, Randolph Building, Customer Service Window

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

TAMMARA PEYTON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tammara Peyton

September 28, 2005